

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/787,119
Response filed December 5, 2005
Reply to OA dated August 5, 2005

REMARKS:

Claims 1-19 are currently pending. Claims 1-5 and 12-16 are currently being considered, of which claims 1, 2, and 12 have been amended. Claims 6-11 and 17-19 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Applicants and Applicants' attorney thank Examiner Rickman for the interview courteously granted in November 2005. The special attention the Examiner paid to the instant application is noted with appreciation. Items discussed during the interview include: the final Office Action mailed August 5, 2005; and aspects relating to a pattern printed region and a filling layer region being different in color.

Claims 1-3 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by USP 5,972,438 (Suzuki).

Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejection of claims 1-3 and 12-14.

Claims 1 and 12, as amended, set forth "said pattern printed region (1) and said filling layer region (2) are different in color", in combination with the other claimed features.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **09/787,119**
Response filed December 5, 2005
Reply to OA dated August 5, 2005

Claim 2, as amended, sets forth "said pattern printed region and said filling layer region each comprise a non-magnetic printing ink", combination with the other claimed features.

The transferable magnetic tape and the magnetic card, according to the present claimed inventions, are not described, taught, or suggested by **Suzuki**.

The pattern formed region of **Suzuki**, which the Examiner asserted that corresponds to the "printed region of the present invention", has the same color as the other region has, and it is difficult to distinguish the pattern formed region and the other region by visual check. For this reason, the technique described in **Suzuki** can be employed for security technology. In contrast, in the present invention, incorporation of a design in a magnetic card is one of the purposes, as is apparent from the description of "Technical Field" of the specification of the present application. Therefore, there is no point in only being able to distinguish patterns formed in the printed region magnetically. Claims 1 and 12, as amended, further clarify this point.

In addition, although the Examiner asserted that she interprets the coding layer of **Suzuki**, which comprises particles in a binder and is applied via a printing process, to be equivalent to applicant's claimed "printing ink", the specification of the present application as originally filed (see page 16, line 13) describes that the printing inks employed in the present invention are "non-magnetic". For this reason, claim 2, as amended, further clarifies the point that the coding layer

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **09/787,119**
Response filed December 5, 2005
Reply to OA dated August 5, 2005

of **Suzuki** does not correspond to the printing inks of the present invention.

As described above, it is clear that claims 1, 2, and 12, as amended, are not described, taught, or suggested by **Suzuki**.

Suzuki fails to describe, teach, or suggest the following features set forth in base claims 1 and 12, as amended: “said pattern printed region (1) and said filling layer region (2) are different in color”, in combination with the other claimed features.

Suzuki fails to describe, teach, or suggest the following features set forth in claim 2, as amended: “said pattern printed region and said filling layer region each comprise a non-magnetic printing ink”, in combination with the other claimed features.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the above rejection of claims 1-3 and 12-14 should be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 5, 15, and 16 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over **Suzuki** in view of USP 4,132,350 (**Kubota**).

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **09/787,119**
Response filed December 5, 2005
Reply to OA dated August 5, 2005

Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejection of claims 4, 5, 15, and 16.

Kubota does not remedy the above-described deficiencies of **Suzuki**.

Suzuki and **Kubota**, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the following features set forth in base claims 1 and 12, as amended: "said pattern printed region (1) and said filling layer region (2) are different in color", in combination with the other claimed features.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the above rejection of claims 4, 5, 15, and 16 should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, all claims currently being considered are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/787,119
Response filed December 5, 2005
Reply to OA dated August 5, 2005

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



Darren R. Crew
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 37,806

DRC/llf
Atty. Docket No. 010324
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time